REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-11, 13-14, 16-17, 19, and 20-23 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is requested.

ACTION IS INCOMPLETE

Applicants respectfully submit that the current Office Action is incomplete. As set forth in MPEP §707.07(f) entitled Answer All Material Traversed:

an examiner must provide clear explanations of all actions taken by the examiner during prosecution of an application.

Applicants submit that the Examiner provides <u>no support whatsoever</u> for rejecting many of the recited features of independent claims 1, 7, 8, 10, 14, 17, and 20.

For example, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 7, and 17 relying only on the support used in rejection of claim 23 and does not provide <u>any</u> support regarding the rejection of features recited by claims 1 and 7, using claim 1 as an example, "allowing a collaboration between the role object as the active role and the role object as the passive role."

As another example, the Examiner does not provide <u>any</u> support regarding the rejection of features recited by claims 8, 10, 14, and 20, using claim 8 as an example, including "generating a role object as an active role with respect to information processing means that is a <u>data transmission origin</u>, and a role object as a passive role with respect to information processing means that is a <u>data transmission destination</u>; and... generating a relating object for transmitting information ... that is a <u>data transmission origin</u> and the information processing means that is a <u>data transmission destination</u>." (Emphasis added).

As set forth in MPEP § 706.07(d):

(i)f, on request by applicant for reconsideration, the primary examiner finds the final rejection to have been premature, he or she should withdraw the finality of the rejection.

Summary

Accordingly, Applicants submit that if the rejections are not withdrawn and the case recommended for allowance, that at the least, the finality of the present office action should be withdrawn and a new, complete Office Action be issued with the due date reset.

ITEM 6: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 3, 4, 6-11, 13-14, 16-17 AND 19-23 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY ART DAO ET AL. (U.S.P. 5,596,744)

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 3, 4, 6-11, 13-14, 16-17 and 19-23 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Dao. The rejections are traversed.

Independent claims 1, 7-11, 14, 17, 20, and 23 respectively recite a collaboration apparatus, an integrated information processing system, a computer-readable recording medium, a method, a computer-readable storage, using claim 23 as an example, including "role object generating means for generating a role object as an active role with respect to one of two information processing means to be collaborated, and a role object as a passive role with respect to the other."

As provided in MPEP §706.02 entitled Rejection on Prior Art, anticipation requires that the reference must teach every aspect of a claimed invention. Applicants submit that Dao does not support an anticipatory-type rejection by not describing features recited in the present application's independent claims.

Dao does <u>not</u> teach generating a role object as an active role with respect to one of two information processing means to be collaborated. Rather, Doe merely teaches (see, col. 4, lines 21-26):

(the) <u>extension</u> of the normally passive role of the conventional data dictionary (DD) repository <u>into</u> active and intelligent roles. In the active role, the Smart Data Dictionary (SDD) of the present invention automatically maintains data consistency as new applications or databases are added.

(Emphasis added).

That is, Doe does not teach a role object as an active role <u>with respect to one of two</u> information processing means to be collaborated, and a role object as a passive role <u>with respect to the other</u>, as the Examiner contends, in the lines cited or anywhere else.

Further, independent claims 1 and 7 respectively recite additional features of a collaboration apparatus and an integrated information processing system, using claim 1, as an example, "allowing a collaboration between the role object as the active role and the role object as the passive role."

Doe does not teach these features and the Examiner has <u>not</u> provided any support whatsoever or citation in Doe to support the rejection of this feature.

Yet further, claims 8, 10, 14, and 20 respectively recite an integrated information processing system, a computer-readable recording medium a method, and a computer-readable storage, using claim 8 as an example, including "generating a role object as an active role with respect to information processing means that is a data transmission origin, and a role object as a passive role with respect to information processing means that is a data transmission destination; and... generating a relating object for transmitting information to be stored in a storage apparatus of each information processing means between the role objects in

Serial No. 09/874,283

accordance with a communication system between the information processing means that is a <u>data transmission origin</u> and the information processing means that is a <u>data transmission</u> <u>destination</u>." (Emphasis added).

Doe does not teach these features and the Examiner has <u>not</u> provided any support whatsoever or citation in Doe to support the rejection of this feature.

Summary

Since features recited by claims 1, 3, 4, 6-11, 13-14, 16-17 and 19-23 are not taught by Doe, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 1, 3, 4, 6-11, 13-14, 16-17 and 19-23 allowed.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: November 9, 7005

Paul W. Bobowiec

Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700

Washington, D.C. 20005 Telephone: (202) 434-1500 Facsimile: (202) 434-1501